# **Remarks and Arguments**

In this response, Applicant has amended claims 43, 45-47 and 50-53 and canceled claims 48-49 and 54. The pending claims are 43-47, 50-53, and 55-58.

## **Amendments to Specification**

Applicant has amended the specification to add a brief description of Fig. 1, as requested by the Examiner (see page 1 of the specification for support).

## § 112 Rejections

Applicant has amended the claims to address the prior objections to claims 49 and 53.

## Patentability Rejection

Various claims were rejected as anticipated by one or more of Ito U.S. Patent 5,652,067, Nagayama U.S. Patent 5,949,186 and Tamura U.S. Patent 6,410,168.

Applicant respectfully asserts that the amended claims patentably distinguish over the prior art of record. Ito discloses an encapsulating layer comprising inorganic oxides and fluorides such as LiF. Ito discloses the possibility of utilizing a transparent cathode. However, Ito is silent as to whether the encapsulating layer is a reflectivity-influencing structure.

Nagayama discloses a cathode comprising a lamination of BaO/Al layers. The BaO layer would appear to be an electron injecting layer of approximately 40 angstroms thickness. There is no disclosure that this layer is a reflectivity-influencing structure.

In order to more clearly distinguish independent claim 43 over Ito and Nagayama, independent claim 43 has been amended to specify that the second electrode comprises a charge injecting layer and a reflectivity-influencing structure, the reflectivity-influencing structure being located on an opposite side of the charge injecting layer from the light emissive region. These structural features are neither disclosed or suggested in the cited references. This amendment also distinguishes the invention

over Tamura. These structural features are disclosed, for example, in Figure 2 of the present application and the description thereof.

Applicant has amended the dependent claims to overcome the §112 objections and to conform to the new amended independent claim 43.

#### RECONSIDERATION

It is believed that all claims of the present application are now in condition for allowance.

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that a teleconference would expedite prosecution of the present application the Examiner is invited to call the Applicant's undersigned attorney at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Any amendments or cancellation or submissions with respect to the claims herein is made without prejudice and is not an admission that said canceled or amended or otherwise affected subject matter is not patentable. Applicant reserves the right to pursue canceled or amended subject matter in one or more continuation, divisional or continuation-in-part applications.

To the extent that Applicant has not addressed one or more assertions of the Examiner because the foregoing response is sufficient, this is not an admission by Applicant as to the accuracy of such assertions.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any fees in addition to fees submitted herewith that may be required to enter/allow this response and any accompanying papers to our deposit account 02-3038 and credit any overpayments thereto.

Respectfully submitted

Therese A. Hendricks, Esq., Reg. No. 30,389

KUDIRKA & JOBSE, LLP Customer Number 021127

Tel: (617) 367-4600 Fax: (617) 367-4656

Date: Marce 1, 2006